



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,164	10/25/2001	Thomas S. Messerges	CR00287M	3410
22917	7590	02/22/2007		
MOTOROLA, INC. 1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD IL01/3RD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			EXAMINER ABYANEH, ALI S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/22/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/22/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docketing.Schaumburg@motorola.com
APT099@motorola.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/028,164

Applicant(s)

MESSERGES ET AL.

Examiner

Ali S. Abyaneh

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 26-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10-25-01 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are cancelled.
2. Claims 26-29 are newly added.
3. The declaration filed on 10-30-2006 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been acknowledged and it is sufficient to overcome the Bolosky reference (US Publication No 2002/0194484).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's amendments/arguments filed on 10-30-2006 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent; published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Serret-Avila (US Patent NO. 6,959,384).

As per claim 26

Serret-Avila teaches a method for rendering digital content, the method comprising the steps of: obtaining digital content as a plurality of chunks, wherein

Art Unit: 2137

each chunk of the digital content is separately hashed (column 14, lines 21-22); authenticating a first chunk from the plurality of chunks (column 4, lines 61-65 and fig. 1, block 1102-1112); rendering the first chunk if the first chunk is successfully authenticated (column 15, lines 46-49); authenticating a second chunk from plurality of chunks; rendering the second chunk if the second chunk is successfully authenticated; and continuing to authenticate and render subsequent chunks as long as each chunk is successfully authenticated (column 15, lines 50-55).

As per claim 27

Serret-Avil teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 26 above. Serret-Avila furthermore teaches a methods wherein the step of authenticating a chunk comprises the step of: calculating a hash of the chunk to create a chunk hash of the chunk; comparing the chunk hash to stored chunk hash of the chunk; and if the chunk hash matches the stored chunk hash, successfully authenticating the chunk (column 4, lines 61-67).

As per claim 28

Serret-Avil teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 26 above. Serret-Avila furthermore teaches authenticating a hash table containing a plurality of stored chunk hashes corresponding to the plurality of chunks of content (column 9, lines 44-52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serret-Avila (US Patent NO. 6,959,384) in view of Danieli (US Patent NO. 6,510,513).

As per claim 29

Serret-Avil teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 26 above.

Serret-Avila does not explicitly teach verifying a certificate of authenticity of the hash table; and if the certificate of authenticity of the hash table is verified, authenticating the hash table. However, in an analogous art, Danieli teaches verifying a certificate of authenticity of the hash table; and if the certificate of authenticity of the hash table is verified, authenticating the hash table (column 2, lines 58-65). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Serret-Avil to include verifying a certificate of authenticity of the hash table; and if the certificate of authenticity of the hash table is verified, authenticating the hash table. This would have been obvious because person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do so in order to guarantee

Art Unit: 2137

the authenticity and validity of the data and furthermore to provide security services and policy enforcement for electronic data (column 2, lines 42-43).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Ali Abyaneh *AA*
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2137
02/13/07

E. L. Moise
EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER